

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-34 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

§ 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1-8 and 10-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652 to Helgeson et al. (hereinafter “Helgeson”). The Applicants respectfully disagree. As the Examiner is aware, the examiner “ordinarily should reject each claim on all valid grounds available.” M.P.E.P. §707.07(g) Further, “[w]here a major technical rejection is proper, it should be stated with a full development of reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled with some stereotyped expression.” Id. While the Examiner has failed to note which specific claim(s) is being rejected in the “Response to Arguments” portion of the outstanding Action, for clarity, Applicants will make reference to the claim and claim language most nearly associated with the Examiner’s comments. As the majority of the instant action is a verbatim copy of the previous Action, Applicants traverse the entirety of the rejection under similar rationale and respectfully re-forward their arguments from the immediate preceding Reply.

The Examiner’s position is untenable with respect to the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and specifically to Claim 1, for at least the following reasons.

1. The Helgeson system is a common message passing system which fails to disclose a business logic layer to process client requests. The Examiner's position incorrectly "reads-in" teachings to the Helgeson reference which are neither literally nor inherently within the Helgeson text.

The Helgeson reference is directed solely to common message passing system. A Helgeson system manages data exchanges by implementing a common message passing scheme. This message passing occurs by translating specific local formats into a generic interchange format. *Helgeson, Abstract*. In Helgeson, all local formats are translated into a single generic format for passage and then retranslated to a specific local format for delivery. This is not the recited invention as a Helgeson system does not process client requests. The Helgeson system is only designed to "pass along" data in a generic format. For instance, a Helgeson system is incapable of producing solutions for a particular problem domain. *Instant Application*, Page 10, lines 15-17. In other words, Helgeson is limited to a translation system and is incapable of processing. The Examiner's argument incorrectly attempts to have us believe there is no discernable difference between processing client requests and mere translation.

2. The Examiner's current argument is additionally faulty as Claim 1 recites the feature of a separate presentation layer generally capable of structuring the replies in a manner that makes the replies presentable on different types of client devices according to a tag library. If the Examiner's position (that translation (Helgeson) is equivalent to processing (Instant Claim)) were true, then

there would be no need for a separate presentation layer capable of structuring replies (in the Instant Claim) as the business logic layer would translate between the specific local format and the generic message format. The Examiner's argument fails because each term in a claim (i.e., processing, structuring replies) has a different meaning. Moreover, the business logic layer and the presentation layer recite different functionalities.

3. Claim 1 in part recites "a presentation layer . . . that makes the replies presentable on different types of client devices according to a tag library containing pre-constructed tags for a variety of data formats." The Examiner's reliance on the "style sheets" as teaching this feature is incorrect. In the preceding Reply, Applicants noted that the Helgeson's style sheets were maps thus, for each translation, the system would need a map which traced the entire local format to the generic format to a local format route. In this manner, each Helgeson translation required a map. Correspondingly, an entire map would be necessary for each translation and only one result occurs per translation. In contrast, the present claim recites the utilization of a tag library making use of pre-constructed tags. For example, a program tag includes a name attribute that specifies the name of the program. *Instant Application*, Page 27, lines 4-5. Other tag attributes are also possible. Other tags and tag attributes permit adaptation. In contrast, the Helgeson style-sheets result in only a single translation response (i.e., no customization or variation is possible). In the instant claim, the need for a "style sheet" or map is avoided and the presentation layer adaptability is increased. *Instant Application*, Page 34, line 19-25. For example, utilization of a tag library

containing various tags may permit selective output rendering. *Instant Application*, Page 34, lines 22-25. Removal of the pending rejection to Claim 1 is specifically requested and allowance is solicited. Removal of the pending rejection to independent Claim 12 is specifically requested based on the same general rationale; although Applicants note Claim 12 implements differing language. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance solicited.

With respect to Claim 2, the Examiner incorrectly asserts Helgeson as disclosing application reconfiguration to other business domains. Not only does Helgeson fail to teach a reconfiguration for other domains but, this teaching would conflict with the express purpose of utilizing a single generic transfer language (e.g., all local formats are translated into a common format). For example, in Helgeson, changing business domains would necessitate changing each and every style-sheet to the new domain to ensure proper translation. Helgeson attempts to avoid this translation problem by translating specific local formats into a generic format for passage. Reconfiguration of the Helgeson system would effectively require the Helgeson system be built from the ground-up. Removal of the pending rejection is respectfully requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

The pending rejection to Claim 3 (Argument: Helgeson fails to disclose the presentation layer is configured to determine a layout of content in the replies) is incorrect and should be removed. The Examiner's pending rejection to Claim 1 and to Claim 3 both refer to the Web Development Kit (WDK) 523 as disclosing a presentation layer and in the case of Claim 3 "wherein the presentation layer is

configured to determine a layout of content in the replies.” The Examiner’s position is incorrect because the WDK of Helgeson is merely a module which may permit decoupling of infrastructure from applications. *Helgeson*, Col. 49, lines 21-26. The WDK does not decide the layout of the content in the reply. Instead, the Helgeson system relies on style-sheets to generate specific local formats for the web clients 515. This is to say, the WDK is only a tool for personnel to render web content and does not determine content layout. *Helgeson*, Col. 49, lines 55-59. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance solicited.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) (Argument: Helgeson fails to disclose a presentation tier to determine how the replies will appear on the client devices to users.”) The Examiner incorrectly cites “col 6, lines 44-50; (fig 8A-8C and 17; col 6, lines 44-50. . .” for this teaching. Neither the cited portions of Helgeson nor anywhere does Helgeson teach or suggest a presentation tier having this capability. The cited Helgeson portions only disclose the WDK 523 and the Web Content server 800 (utilized to perform the functions of the WDK). As noted directly above, the WDK is merely a tool for decoupling infrastructure from applications to overcome tightly bound infrastructure/application issues. The WDK does not determine how the replies will appear. The WDK functions to facilitate the exchange of data in the system (*Helgeson*, Col. 49, lines 29-30) and permit developer access to applications on the platform (*Helgeson*, Col. 49, lines 35-39). Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

With regards to Claim 20 (“Argument: Helgeson fails to disclose the presentation tier is configured to select a data encoding format for encoding the data and a communications protocol in which to send the data to the client device.”) Applicants disagree. The cited portions of Helgeson, Col 57 lines 47-48; col 86, lines 35-51, fail to disclose “wherein the presentation tier is configured to select a data encoding format for encoding the data and a communications protocol in which to send the data to the client device.” First, the Examiner’s argument fails to address the language differences in independent Claim 18, from which Claim 20 depends, versus Claims 1 and 5 and merely relies on the “same reasons”. Second, the Examiner’s attempt to characterize the “interconnect backbone”, discussed in the cited passages, as containing the presentation tier rather than the WDK (which has been previously asserted as disclosing a presentation tier) makes the current argument inconsistent with the rest of the outstanding Action. Third, the interconnect backbone (*Helgeson*, FIG. 9) is implemented to interconnect higher level services (*Helgeson*, Col. 86, lines 9-10) instead of determining how data for communication to a client device is to be presented and selecting a data encoding format. For instance, the interconnect is utilized to provide foundation services for messaging, service registration, monitoring and management. *Helgeson*, Col. 86, lines 9-13. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is solicited.

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the

application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Dec. 15 2006

By:


Nathan T. Grebasch
Reg. No. 48,600
(509) 324-9256 x228